DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 632 JC 920 159

AUTHOR Knight, William E.
INSTITUTION Kent State Univ., OH. Regional Campuses. Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services.
TITLE Regional Campuses Non-Enrolling Student Study.
PUB DATE Mar 92
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Admission (School); *College Applicants; *Enrollment Influences; *No Shows; Questionnaires; State Universities; Student Educational Objectives; Surveys; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS Kent State University OH Regional Campuses

ABSTRACT

In 1991, a study was conducted at the regional campuses of Kent State University to determine the characteristics of students who were admitted but did not enroll; their reasons for not enrolling; and their opinions of the academic and student services provided. Demographic and admissions data were available for all 952 students who were admitted but did not enroll for fall 1991. Half of these students were randomly selected for a survey. Study findings, based on a 15% response rate, included the following: (1) 65% of the reespondents were employed, and most who were not employed were so by choice or due to family responsibilities; (2) 49% said they wished to obtain an associate degree, and 40% said a bachelor's degree was their goal; (3) obtaining an associate degree was the most frequently cited academic goal, preparing for a new career the most important career goal, meeting people the most important social participation goal, and learning skills to enrich their lives the most important personal goal; (4) 46% of the students said they did not enroll because they could not afford to attend; (5) unspecified personal reasons, slow financial aid processing, and distance from the campus were also commonly cited reasons for not enrolling; and (6) 25% to 57% of the respondents rated as high or very high their satisfaction with the availability and quality of academic advising (29-30%), admissions (57%), and financial aid (25%). The survey instrument is attached. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED343632

REGIONAL CAMPUSES NON-ENROLLING STUDENT STUDY

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
REGIONAL CAMPUSES
OFFICE OF ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION SERVICES

MARCH 1992

Jc920 159

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. Knight
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

TITLE:	REGIONAL CAMPUSES NON-ENROLLING STUDENT STUDY
AUTHOR:	William E. Knight, Coordinator, Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services, Regional Campuses
SUBJECT:	A Study of the Kent Regional Campuses Fall 1991 New Students Who Were Admitted But Did Not Enroll
DATE:	March, 1992
SOURCE OF COPIES:	Kent State University Regional Campuses Lincoln Building Kent, Ohio 44242 (216) 672-2330
DISTRIBUTION LIST:	President Acting Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs Vice President for Institutional Advancement Vice Provost for Regional Campuses Vice Provost for Student Affairs Members, Academic and Student Affairs Policy Council Dean for Academic Affairs, Regional Campuses Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs, Regional Campuses Director of Business Affairs, Regional Campuses Assistant Director of Business Affairs, Regional Campuses Director of Student Information and Records, Regional Campuses Regional Campus Deans Regional Campus Directors of Student Affairs and Registrars Regional Campus Admissions Officers
NUMBER OF PAGES:	vi, 20
ABSTRACT:	This study was undertaken to describe the characteristics of students who were admitted for the Fall 1991 semester but did not enroll, the reasons they did not enroll, and their opinions of academic and student services.

CONTENTS

		Page
Abstract		i
Contents		ii
Tables		iii
Summary		iv
I. STUDY DESCRIPTION		
A.	Background	1
B.	Objectives of the Study	1
C.	Study Design	2
D.	Sampling	2
E.	Analyses	3
II. SURVEY RESULTS		
A.	Characteristics of the Respondents	4
B.	Reasons Students Did Not Enroll	7
C.	Opinions of Academic and Student Services	8
D.	Open-Ended Comments	9
Tables		10
III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS		12
III. APPENDIX: The Survey		15

TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Ages of Non-Enrolled and New Enrolled Students	10
Table 2	High School Graduation Year of Non-Enrolled and New Enrolled Students	11

SUMMARY

The study was conducted in the fall of 1991. It was undertaken to describe the characteristics of Regional Campuses students who were admitted but did not enroll, the reasons they did not enroll, and their opinions of the academic and student services provided.

The study consisted of two parts: the analysis of data collected at the time of admission, and the administration and subsequent data analysis of a survey which asked these students questions about their goals, the reasons they did not enroll, and their opinions of some of the services they may have used. Demographic and admissions data were available for all 952 students who were admitted but did not enroll for Fall 1991. The survey sample consisted of one-half of this group randomly selected from the 952 total students. A 15% survey response rate was obtained (n=72). The respondents were generally representative of all Regional Campuses students with respect to gender, ethnicity, age, ethnicity and campus attended.

The three objectives of the survey and the results are as follows:

1. To describe the characteristics of students who were admitted but did not enroll.

They shared many of the same characteristics with new Regional Campuses students who did enroll; sixty-two percent of those who did not enroll were female and five percent were minorities; forty-seven percent of non-enrolling students were admitted conditionally; forty-three percent were 1991 high school graduates while thirty-nine percent graduated five or more years ago; seventy-percent of non-enrolling students were admitted into the College of Arts and Sciences; fifty-seven percent of non-enrolling students were between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one and average age was twenty-four.

The percentages of students in the study who were admitted to each campus generally reflected the percentages of all new freshmen students. Sixty-five percent of respondents were employed and most who were not employed were so due to their own choice or due to family responsibilities. The Regional Campuses were the first enrollment choice of 78% of respondents.

Forty-nine percent of respondents said they wished to obtain an associate degree and 40% said a bachelors degree was their goal. Obtaining an associate degree was the most frequently cited as respondents' most important academic goal; preparing for a new career was their most important career goal; to meet people was their most important social participation goal; and to learn skills to enrich their lives and make them more complete people was their most important personal goal.

Most respondents who did not enroll at a Regional Campus were not enrolled at another college or university. Most who were enrolled somewhere else were at four year institutions. Sixty-one percent of respondents said their overall satisfaction with their experience with Regional Campuses was very high or high. Fifty-nine percent would consider enrolling at a later date at a Regional Campus; 30% were unsure if they would enroll later.

2. To learn the reasons students who were admitted did not enroll.

The reasons most frequently chosen by respondents tended to group into the four categories listed below. The percentage given indicates the percentage of respondents indicating this was a very important or important reason to them for not attending.

Economic Reasons: could not afford to attend (46%), did not receive a grant or loan for which they had applied (37%)

Personal Reasons: unspecified personal reasons (29%), unsure of their academic goals (24%), job responsibilities were too great (20%), family responsibilities were too great (18%)

Service Delivery Reasons: financial aid not processed in a timely manner (21%), did not receive sufficient academic advising (17%)

Access Reasons: the campus was too far away (12%), the respondent had no transportation to the campus (12%)

Items in the open-ended comments included: the other colleges which were students' first choices, other colleges to which they had applied, and other colleges in which they were presently enrolled. Few institutions were listed, but those that were included other Regional Campuses, Kent, Stark Technical College, Youngstown State University, and Ohio State University. Non-enrolling students' prospective majors tended to be those which are the more popular majors for enrolled students. Better resolution of financial aid problems and curricular changes were listed as issues which could have affected students' enrollment choices.

3. To learn respondents' opinions regarding the academic and student services provided.

The respondents rated from very high to very low their satisfaction with four academic and student services. Twenty-nine percent said their satisfaction with the availability of academic advising was very high or high. Thirty percent said their satisfaction with the quality of academic advising was very high or high. Fifty-seven percent were very highly or highly satisfied with admissions. Twenty-five percent of respondents reported their satisfaction with financial aid as very high or high.

Conclusions

The demographic characteristics and educational goals of non-enrolling students were essentially the same as for those who did enroll. Aside from the personal reasons for not enrolling, which included conflicting job and family responsibilities, the most frequently reported reasons why students did not enroll can be broadly classified into access and service delivery reasons. Access-related reasons for not enrolling included lack of economic access (not being able to afford to attend and not receiving financial aid) and geographic access (the campus being too far away and not having transportation). Service delivery reasons for not enrolling included financial aid delivery problems and insufficient advising. While more than one half of the respondents said their satisfaction with the admissions process was very high or high, only one quarter to one third of respondents gave the same rating to advising or financial aid.

These conclusions must be considered in light of the low response rate of 15% (n=72) for the survey portion of the study.

I. STUDY DESCRIPTION

A. Background

This study was undertaken by the Regional Campuses Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services to learn more about why some students who are admitted do not enroll. A system emphasis upon enrollment management and access to educational opportunities provided an important background to the study.

This document represents a detailed analysis of both the admissions records of new students who were admitted to the Regional Campuses for Fall 1991 but did not enroll as well as the responses of a survey sent to one-half of this population. The purpose of the study was to develop a framework for analysis that would assist the Regional Campuses in improving enrollment management and academic and student services for future students. While surveys have been conducted in the past at certain campuses in response to specific information needs, this was the first attempt to present non-enrolling student information in a comprehensive way on an overall Regional Campuses system level. This study was, therefore, additionally designed to serve as a benchmark for comparison purposes with future studies. It also contributes to the growing body of enrollment management research conducted by the Office.[1]

B. Objectives of the Study

This study sought to meet the following three objectives:

To gain information concerning the characteristics of students who were admitted but did not enroll.

To ascertain some of the reasons for students' decisions not to enroll.

To learn the opinions of academic and student services of students who were admitted but did not enroll.

[1] Other enrollment management studies include the 1990 Regional Campuses Alumni Survey, the 1990 Time to Associate Degree Study, the 1990 New Freshmen Survey, the 1991 Non-Returning Student Survey, and the 1991 Bachelors Degree Study.

C. Study Design

The study consisted of two parts. First, demographic and admissions data for students (N=952) who were admitted for Fall 1991 but did not enroll were compared with that for new students who did enroll. Second, a survey was sent to one half-of the non-enrolling population which asked about educational goals, reasons for not enrolling, and about non-enrolling students' opinions of the campus services they may have used.

The survey was constructed after consultation with the Kent Campus Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services which undertook a similar effort in 1989. A draft survey was reviewed by the Vice Provost for Regional Campuses, Dean for Academic Affairs, Regional Campus Deans, and members of the Information Officers Advisory Group. It was modified as a result of the comments of these reviewers and was pilot tested by a group of students. A computer scannable answer sheet was included with the final version of the survey, allowing for more efficient analysis of results. Unlike previous surveys carried out by the office, this survey was anonymous and also was accompanied by a personalized cover letter. An enclosure including open-ended questions was also developed, whereby respondents listed other colleges which may have been their first choices, other colleges to which they had applied, other colleges they may be attending, their planned major at the Regional Campuses, and any additional comments concerning why they did not enroll.

D. Sampling

The admissions records of all 952 students who were admitted for Fall 1991 but who did not enroll were available for analysis. Surveys were mailed to a random sample of one-half (476) of this population. Nine surveys were returned as undeliverable. Seventy-two of the remaining 467 surveys were returned, providing a 15% response rate. While this response rate was lower than that for other surveys conducted by the Office and lower than the 40% response rate obtained in telephone surveys of the same type of population at Geauga and Stark, it should still yield results worthy of consideration.

E. Analyses

Admissions records and results of the survey were analyzed by determining the distribution of characteristics and responses and comparing demographic and admissions information to the same information for new students who did enroll. Due to the low response rate survey responses were not analyzed by campus. Open-ended responses were analyzed by searching for common responses and noting the frequencies of these comments. Study results are presented in Section II.

II. STUDY RESULTS

A. Characteristics of the Respondents

Sixty-eight percent of the non-enrolling students were female and 32% were male. This does not differ substantially from the gender profile of new admits who did enroll; 62% were female and 38% were male.

Seventy-nine percent of non-enrolling students were single and 21% were married. Similarly, 76% of new enrolled students were single and 24% were married.

The vast majority of the non-enrolling students (95%) identified themselves as Caucasian. Again this does not differ significantly from the enrolling student profile of 96% Caucasian.

As **Table 1** indicates, there was some distribution of non-enrolling students by age. The largest percentage of the population (57%) was in the 18-21 range. Fourteen percent were in the 22-25 range, 11% in the 26-30 range, 11% in the 31-40 range, 6% in the 41-50 range, and 1% in the 51 or older range. Average age for non-enrolling students was 24. As the table shows, the age distribution was very similar for new students who did enroll.

Forty-seven percent of non-enrolling students were admitted conditionally and 53% were admitted unconditionally. Thirty-six percent of new students who did enroll were admitted conditionally and 64% were admitted unconditionally. The average ACT composite score for non-enrolling students was 16 while for students who enrolled it was 18. Only 9% of the non-enrolling students and 23% of new enrolled students had ACT scores, however.

As **Table 2** shows, 43% of non-enrolling students graduated from high school in 1991, 9% in 1990, 4% in 1989, 5% in 1988, and 39% in 1987 or earlier. This is not substantially different than for those new admits who enrolled.

Seventy percent of non-enrolling students were admitted to the College of Arts and Sciences, 4% to the College of Business Administration, 4% to the College of Education, 21% to the College of Fine and Professional Arts, and 1% to the School of Nursing. These percentages were very similar to those for newly enrolled students at 67%, 5%, 7%, 19%, and 1%, respectively. For both groups, the large percentage of students admitted to the College of Arts and Sciences reflects the policy that undecided students are admitted to that college; Fifty-four percent of non-enrolled students and 38% of new enrolled students are undecided in their major.

A good mixture of responses was received from respondents from each of the campuses. The percentage of respondents from each campus was roughly similar to the percentage of all students attending each of the campuses.

Sixty-five percent of the respondents indicated they were employed, 32% for 40 hours per week, 21% for 20 to 39 hours per week, and 12% for fewer than 20 hours per week. Of the remaining 35%, 21% were unemployed by their own choice or due to family responsibilities and 13% were seeking employment. This matches the student employment rate for new students found in previous studies.

Seventy-eight percent of the total respondents reported that the Regional Campuses were their first choice when they considered colleges in which to enroll. This is similar to the 63% of respondents to the 1990 New Freshmen Survey who indicated the Regional Campuses were their first choice.

The largest percentage the respondents (49%) indicated that they were interested in an associate degree. Forty percent reported they were interested in a bachelors degree. Six percent of the respondents were not seeking a degree, and 5% were working toward a graduate degree. This is compared with 49% of new freshmen in the 1990 New Freshmen Survey indicating they were currently working toward an associate degree and the 43% who said they were working for a bachelors degree.

The largest percentage of the respondents (41%) said that their most important academic goal was obtaining an associate degree. Seventeen percent of respondents each said completing courses for relocation to the Kent Campus and completing the courses necessary to increase knowledge and understanding in an academic field were their most important academic goals. Fifteen percent were unsure of their academic goals and 10% said their most important academic goal was to complete courses to transfer to another institution. Similarly, this contrasts with 40% of 1990 new freshmen who said their most important goal was relocation to another institution and the 35% who said their most important goal was to obtain a bachelors degree.

To prepare for a new career was the most frequent career goal of respondents at 62%. To explore career interests was most important for 19%, and improving knowledge, technical skills, or competencies in the current career was the most important goal for 13%. Increasing the chances for a raise or promotion was listed as the most important career goal by 4% of the respondents. Two percent were unsure of their career preparation goals. This matches the profile of career goals of the 1990 new enrolled freshmen.

The greatest percentage of the respondents (52%) had no social or cultural participation goal in mind or were unsure. To meet new people was the most frequently cited social or cultural participation goal at 22%. Becoming actively involved in campus life and activities was most important for 16%. Getting to know people who think and feel differently than they do was listed as the most important goal by 9%. Again, this matched the social goals of 1990 new freshmen.

To learn skills that will enrich their lives or make them more complete people was the most important goal for 66% of respondents. To increase self-confidence was listed by 18% of the respondents. Sixteen percent had no personal development goal in mind. This also matched the profile of 1990 new freshmen.

Seventy-three percent of respondents said they were not currently enrolled in another college or university. Among those students who were, 44% were enrolled at a four-year public college or university, 28% were enrolled at a community college, 16% were enrolled at a technical college, 8% were enrolled in a vocational school, and 4% were enrolled at another two-year college.

Forty percent said their overall satisfaction with the Regional Campuses was high and an additional 21% said it was very high. Twenty-eight percent were moderately satisfied, 2% were unsatisfied, and 8% were very unsatisfied.

Fifty-nine percent of the respondents said they would consider enrolling at a later date at a Regional Campus, 34% next semester, 22% next year, and 3% in more than a year. Thirty percent were unsure and 11% would not consider enrolling later at a Regional Campus.

B. Reasons Students Did Not Enroll

Thirty possible reasons students did not enroll were listed and respondents were asked to rate the importance of each reason for them. Ten of these reasons were listed by more than ten percent of the respondents as very important or important and are listed below.

Reason	Very Important or Important
Could not afford to attend	46%
Personal reasons	29%
Did not receive a grant for which the student had applied	26%
Unsure of educational goals	24%
Financial aid was not processed in a timely manner	21%
Job responsibilities were too great	20%
Family responsibilities were too great	18%
Did not receive sufficient advising assistance	17%
Campus was too far away	12%
No transportation to the campus	12%
Did not receive a loan for which the student had applied	11%

Due to the low response rate of 15% (n=72), reasons for not enrolling were not analyzed by campus nor contrasted by demographic or educational variables. This low response rate should also be remembered when interpreting the preceding results.

C. Opinions of Academic and Student Services

The respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with some of the student services provided by the Regional Campuses. Respondents were asked not to rate the services they did not use; this accounts for the "did not respond" category. The results are as follows:

Availability of Academic Advising	11%	Very High
	18%	High
	15%	Moderate
	6%	Low
	8%	Very Low
	42%	Did Not Respond
Quality of Academic Advising	8%	Very High
	22%	High
	14%	Moderate
	7%	Low
	8%	Very Low
	41%	Did Not Respond
Admissions	14%	Very High
	43%	High
	24%	Moderate
	3%	Low
	3%	Very Low
	13%	Did Not Respond
Financial Aid	8%	Very High
	17%	High
	21%	Moderate
	4%	Low
	14%	Very Low
	36%	Did Not Respond

Again, due to the low response rate, opinions of services were not analyzed by campus nor contrasted by demographic or educational variables.

D. Open-Ended Comments

The respondents were requested on a supplemental answer sheet to list other colleges serving as first enrollment choices, other colleges they were attending, other colleges to which they applied, their intended major, and what the Regional Campuses could have done differently to have influenced them to attend. These data were analyzed by searching for common responses and noting their frequencies. Responses which appeared more than twice are listed below for each of these five topics.

Other Colleges Which Served as First Enrollment Choices

another Regional Campus	3

Colleges In Which Respondents Are Presently Enrolled

Stark Technical College	3
Youngstown State University	3

Other Colleges To Which Respondents Applied

Kent	4
Ohio State University	3
Youngstown State University	3

Students' Majors

Nursing (AD or BD)	14
Business	6
Computer Technology	5
Accounting	4

What Could the Campus Have Done Differently to Influence Respondents To Attend?

Better Treatment by Student Services Offices	5
Better Resolution of Financial Aid Problems	3
Change Curricula	3

TABLE 1

AGES OF NON-ENROLLING STUDENTS		AGES OF NEW ENROLLED STUDENTS	
AGE RANGE	PERCENT	AGE RANGE	PERCENT
18-21	57%	18-21	55%
22-25	14%	22-25	13%
26-30	11%	26-30	10%
31-40	11%	31-40	14%
41-50	6%	41-50	6%
51 and Over	1%	51 and Over	1%

TABLE 2

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION YEAR

NON-ENROLLING STUDENTS		NEW ENROLLED STUDENTS	
YEAR	PERCENT	YEAR	PERCENT
1987 or Earlier	39%	1987 or Earlier	40%
1988	5%	1988	6%
1989	4%	1989	7%
1990	9%	1990	11%
1991	43%	1991	36%

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Summary

The fall 1991 Non-Enrolling Student Study represented an attempt to better understand why some students who are admitted to the Regional Campuses do not enroll. The specific goals of the survey were 1) to describe the characteristics of students who did not enroll, 2) to learn the reasons students did not enroll, and 3) to gather the perceptions of academic and student services by students who did not enroll.

The study consisted of two parts: the analysis of data collected at the time of admission, and the administration and subsequent data analysis of a survey which asked these students questions about their goals, the reasons they did not enroll, and opinions of some of the services they may have used. Demographic and admissions data were available for all 952 students who were admitted but did not enroll for Fall 1991. The survey sample consisted of a random selection of one-half of this group. A 15% survey response rate was obtained (n=72). The respondents were generally representative of all Regional Campuses students with respect to gender, ethnicity, age, ethnicity and campus attended.

The three objectives of the study and the results are as follows:

1. To describe the characteristics of students who were admitted but did not enroll.

They shared many of the same characteristics as new Regional Campuses students who did enroll; sixty-two percent of those who did not enroll were female and five percent were minorities; forty-seven percent of non-enrolling students were admitted conditionally; forty-three percent were 1991 high school graduates while thirty-nine percent graduated five or more years ago; seventy-percent of non-enrolling students were admitted into the College of Arts and Sciences; fifty-seven percent of non-enrolling students were between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one and average age was twenty-four. The percentages of students in the study admitted to each campus generally reflected the percentages of all new freshmen students.

Sixty-five percent of respondents were employed and most who were not employed were so do to their own choice or due to family responsibilities. The Regional Campuses were the first enrollment choice of 78% of respondents. Forty-nine percent of respondents said they wished to obtain an associate degree and 40% said a bachelors degree was their goal. Obtaining an associate degree was the most frequently cited as respondents' most important academic goal; preparing for a new career was their most important career goal; to meet people was their most important social participation goal; and to learn skills to enrich their lives and make them more complete people was their most important personal goal.

Most respondents were not enrolled at another college or university. Most who were enrolled somewhere else were at four year institutions. Sixty-one percent of respondents said their overall satisfaction with the Regional Campuses was very high or high. Fifty-nine percent would consider enrolling again at a Regional Campus; 30% were unsure if they would enroll again.

2. To learn the reasons students who were admitted did not enroll.

The reasons most frequently chosen by respondents tended to group into the four categories listed below. The percentage given indicates the percentage of respondents indicating this was a very important or important reason to them for not attending.

Economic Reasons:	could not afford to attend (46%), did not receive a grant or loan for which they had applied (37%)
Personal Reasons:	unspecified personal reasons (29%), unsure of their academic goals (24%), job responsibilities were too great (20%), family responsibilities were too great (18%)
Service Delivery Reasons:	financial aid not processed in a timely manner (21%), did not receive sufficient academic advising (17%)
Access Reasons:	the campus was too far away (12%), the respondent had no transportation to the campus (12%)

Included in the open-ended comments were the other colleges which were students' first choices, other colleges to which they had applied, and other colleges in which they were presently enrolled. Few institutions were listed, but those that were included other Regional Campuses, Kent, Stark Technical College, Youngstown State University, and Ohio State University. Non-enrolling students' prospective majors tended to be those which are the more popular majors for enrolled students. Better resolution of financial aid problems and curricular changes were listed as issues which could have affected students' enrollment choices. The low survey response rate (n=72) limited the generalizability of the results.

3. To learn respondents' opinions regarding the academic and student services provided.

The respondents rated from very high to very low their satisfaction with four academic and student services. Twenty-nine percent said their satisfaction with the availability of academic advising was very high or high. Thirty percent said their satisfaction with the quality of academic advising was very high or high. Fifty-seven percent were very highly or highly satisfied with admissions. Twenty-five percent of respondents reported their satisfaction with financial aid as very high or high.

Conclusions

The demographic characteristics and educational goals of non-enrolling students were essentially the same as for those who did enroll. Aside from the personal reasons for not enrolling, which included conflicting job and family responsibilities, the most frequently reported reasons students did not enroll can be broadly classified into access and service delivery reasons. Access-related reasons for not enrolling included lack of economic access (not being able to afford to attend and not receiving financial aid) and geographic access (the campus being too far away and not having transportation). Service delivery reasons for not enrolling included financial aid delivery problems and insufficient advising. While more than one half of the respondents said their satisfaction with the admissions process was very high or high, only one quarter to one third of respondents gave the same rating to advising or financial aid.

APPENDIX: The Survey

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read the directions at the bottom of the answer sheet and fill in the correct circle on the answer sheet for each question. It is not necessary to give your name or ID number on the computer or supplemental answer sheets.

1. What is your gender?

   A. Female
   B. Male

2. How do you describe yourself?

   A. African American/Black
   B. Asian American
   C. Caucasian/White
   D. Hispanic American
   E. Native American
   F. Other

3. How old are you?

   A. 18 to 21 years
   B. 22 to 25 years
   C. 26 to 30 years
   D. 31 to 40 years
   E. 41 to 50 years
   F. 51 to 60 years
   G. 61 years or older

4. To which Regional Campus were you admitted for Fall 1991?

   A. Ashtabula
   B. East Liverpool
   C. Geauga
   D. Salem
   E. Stark
   F. Trumbull
   G. Tuscarawas

5. How would you describe your current employment status?

   A. Unemployed, seeking employment
   B. Unemployed by own choice or due to family responsibilities
   C. Employed fewer than 20 hours per week
   D. Employed 20 to 39 hours per week
   E. Employed 40 hours per week
   F. Employed more than 40 hours per week

6. Was the Kent State University Regional Campus listed in Question 4 your first choice when you considered colleges in which to enroll?

   A. Yes
   B. No

7. What college degree did you have in mind when you were admitted?

   A. Not seeking a degree
   B. Associate Degree
   C. Bachelors Degree
   D. Graduate Degree

8. Which was your most important **academic** goal when you were admitted?

   A. To complete some courses to increase your knowledge and understanding in an academic field
   B. To obtain an Associate Degree
   C. To complete courses to relocate to the Kent Campus
   D. To complete courses to transfer to another college
   E. Other or not sure

9. Which was your most important **career preparation** goal when you were admitted?

   A. To explore career interests
   B. To prepare for a new career
   C. To improve your knowledge, technical skills, and/or competencies in your current job or career
   D. To increase your chances for a raise and/or a promotion
   E. Other or not sure

10. Which was your most important **social/cultural participation** goal when you were admitted?

   A. To become actively involved in student life and campus activities
   B. To meet people
   C. To get to know people who feel and think differently than you do
   D. Other or not sure
   E. No social goal in mind

11. Which was your most important **personal development and enrichment** goal when you were admitted?

   A. To increase your self-confidence
   B. To increase your ability to get along with others
   C. To learn skills that will improve your daily life and make you a more complete person
   D. No personal development goal in mind

12. Are you currently enrolled in another school, college, or university?

A. Yes B. No

13. If you answered yes to Question 12 above, what kind of institution?

A. Four-year public college or university
B. Four-year private college or university
C. Community college
D. Technical college or school
E. Vocational school

Please rate the importance of each of the following reasons for your decision not to enroll at a Regional Campus this Fall using the following scale:

A. Not at all a reason
B. A very minor reason
C. Somewhat of a reason or unsure
D. An important reason
E. A very important reason

14.	The campus did not offer the academic major I wanted.	A	B	C	D	E
15.	The campus did not offer the courses I wanted.	A	B	C	D	E
16.	Courses were not offered at convenient times.	A	B	C	D	E
17.	Another college had a better program in my major.	A	B	C	D	E
18.	Another college had a better academic reputation.	A	B	C	D	E
19.	It was too far to commute from home or work to the campus.	A	B	C	D	E
20.	I did not have transportation to the campus.	A	B	C	D	E
21.	I could not afford to attend.	A	B	C	D	E
22.	I did not receive a federal or state grant (Pell, OIG) for which I applied.	A	B	C	D	E

A. Not at all a reason
B. A very minor reason
C. Somewhat of a reason or unsure
D. An important reason
E. A very important reason

23.	I did not receive a scholarship for which I applied.	A	B	C	D	E
24.	I did not receive a loan for which I applied.	A	B	C	D	E
25.	My financial aid award was not processed in a timely manner.	A	B	C	D	E
26.	I could not attend this semester due to family responsibilities.	A	B	C	D	E
27.	I could not attend this semester due to job responsibilities.	A	B	C	D	E
28.	I could not attend this semester due to personal reasons.	A	B	C	D	E
29.	I intended to enroll at another college and applied to the Regional Campus as a back-up.	A	B	C	D	E
30.	I attended another college because I felt more comfortable there.	A	B	C	D	E
31.	The campus was too close too home.	A	B	C	D	E
32.	The campus did not offer the student social activities I was looking for.	A	B	C	D	E
33.	My family did not want me to attend.	A	B	C	D	E
34.	My friends did not want me to attend.	A	B	C	D	E
35.	I did not want to enroll in the developmental classes that were recommended or required.	A	B	C	D	E
36.	The courses I would have taken were not challenging enough academically.	A	B	C	D	E
37.	I did not receive enough academic advising assistance.	A	B	C	D	E

A.	Not at all a reason	D.	An important reason			
B.	A very minor reason	E.	A very important reason			
C.	Somewhat of a reason or unsure					
38.	I moved from the area.	A	B	C	D	E
39.	I was unable to attend due to illness on my part.	A	B	C	D	E
40.	I was unable to attend due to illness on the part of a family member.	A	B	C	D	E
41.	The campus did not have the athletic opportunities I was looking for.	A	B	C	D	E
42.	I am unsure of my future plans and need to consider my priorities.	A	B	C	D	E
43.	I wanted to attend a college with a larger number of students.	A	B	C	D	E

Please rate your overall satisfaction with the treatment you received from the services listed below. **Please do not rate services you did not use** and use the following scale:

A	Very Low	D	High
B	Low	E	Very High
C	Moderate		

44.	Admissions	A	B	C	D	E
45.	Financial Aid	A	B	C	D	E
46.	Fee Payment	A	B	C	D	E
47.	Library Services	A	B	C	D	E
48.	Office hours for student services offices	A	B	C	D	E
49.	Availability of academic advising	A	B	C	D	E
50.	Quality of academic advising	A	B	C	D	E
51.	Overall satisfaction with the Regional Campus	A	B	C	D	E

52. Would you consider enrolling at a Kent State University Regional Campus in the future?

A	Yes, next semester	D	Unsure
B	Yes, next year	E	No
C	Yes, in more than a year from now		

SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWER SHEET

53. What college was your first choice if you answered no to Question 6?

_____

54. What school, college, or university are you presently attending if you answered yes to Question 12?

_____

55. To what other colleges did you apply?

_____

56. What academic major were you thinking of when you were admitted? If you were undecided please write "undecided."

_____

57. What could the Regional Campus have done differently to have influenced you to enroll there?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
MAY 15 1992